ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA735186 03/22/2016

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91215993
Party	Defendant Karma Champagne, Inc.
Correspondence Address	GARY L EASTMAN EASTMAN & MCCARTNEY LLP 401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1785 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 UNITED STATES gary@eastmanmccartney.com, docket@eastmanmccartney.com
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	Gary L. Eastman
Filer's e-mail	gary@eastmanmccartney.com
Signature	/**Gary L. Eastman**/
Date	03/22/2016
Attachments	Motion to Stay Proceedings.FINAL.pdf(433554 bytes)

	(() ラナム.)(<i>)</i> - 十十	
4 5	401 West A Street, Suite 1785 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 230-1144 Attorneys for Applicant KARMA CHAMPAGNE, INC.	
6 7 8 9		TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE AL AND APPEAL BOARD
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	KARMA CULTURE, LLC, Opposer, v. KARMA CHAMPAGNE, INC., Applicant.	Opposition No.: 91215993 Mark: KARMA CALIFORNIA BRUT Serial No.: 77876479 APPLICANT'S MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING OUTCOME OF PENDING CIVIL ACTION
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Application for "KARMA CALIFOR moves the Trademark Trial and Appe pending the outcome of a pending civ Culture, LLC ("Opposer") has instituted Culture, LLC vs. Karma Champagne,	Inc. ("Applicant"), owner of U.S. Trademark NIA BRUT," Serial No. 77/876479, hereby als Board ("Board") to suspend proceedings il action. Specifically, Opposer Karma and Case No. 6:16-cv-6183 titled <i>Karma Inc.</i> , United States District Court for the Sixil Action"). A copy of the Complaint is
25262728	attached as Exhibit A. According to the Complaint, O United States Trademark Registration	Civil Action"). A copy of the Complaint is pposer alleges ownership and validity of No. 4,063,528 for KARMA, and its First ringement in Violation of Section 32 of the

1
 2
 3

Lanham Act, and seeks remedies including injunction relief prohibiting Applicant from using Applicant's KARMA CALIFORNIA BRUT mark, or any other mark confusingly similar thereto.

In response to the filing of this Action, Applicant is preparing and will file in due course an Answer denying all allegations of infringement in the Complaint and alleging priority of use, and a Counterclaim challenging the validity of Opposer's mark, seeking cancellation of the mark under a variety of bases including at least abandonment and fraud, and resolving the dispute surrounding this Opposition, namely, the registrability of Applicant's KARMA CALIFORNIA BRUT mark.

ARGUMENT

The Determination in <u>Karma Culture</u>, <u>LLC vs. Karma Champagne</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, Will Have A Direct Bearing On the Issues Before The TTAB.

Where a party to a case pending before the Board is also involved in a civil action that may have a bearing on the T.T.A.B. matter, the Board may suspend the proceeding until the final determination of the civil action. 37 CFR § 2.117(a); TBMP § 510.02(a). This is because "a decision by the United States District Court would be binding on the United States Patent and Trademark Office whereas a determination by the Patent Office as to the respondent's right to retain its registration would not be binding nor would res judicata automatically attach based on a determination by the USPTO with respect to a subsequent or contemporaneous proceeding before the federal district court." Whopper-Burger, Inc. v. Burger King Corp., 171 U.S.P.Q. 805, 807 (T.T.A.B. 1971). A court's decision regarding the right to registration is binding on the T.T.A.B. The Seven-Up Cp. V. Bubble Up Co., 136 U.S.P.Q. 210, 214 (C.C.P.A. 1963); see also In re

McCarthy, 4 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition § 32:94 (4th ed. 2006) (hereinafter "McCarthy").

Opposer and Applicant are both parties to the Civil Action, the only known

Alfred Dunhill Ltd., 224 U.S.P.Q. 501, 503 (T.T.A.B. 1984); J. Thomas

Opposer and Applicant are both parties to the Civil Action, the only known parties named at the present time, with Applicant in the position of Defendant and Opposer in the position of the Plaintiff. The Civil Action is a live and ongoing litigation which at the present time is currently pending before the Western District Court of New York. At the time of the submission of the present Motion, the Plaintiff has filed the Complaint and Civil Cover Sheet, and the Court has issued a Summons. Opposer has informally served its Summons upon counsel for Applicant.

Generally speaking, a final determination by a District Court in a trademark infringement litigation can take a matter of months and in some cases, a matter of years. Both the present proceeding and the matter before the District Court are exhaustive of state and federal monetary resources as well as the man-hours of government employees involved in both proceedings. In order to minimize the time, money and resources expended by both parties as well as the overseeing governmental agencies, the most effective course of action for the Board at this time would be to suspend the present proceeding until such a time that the District Court renders a final judgment or sends instructions for the Board to proceed in the present matter.

With respect to similarities between and the overlapping nature of the present Opposition Proceeding and the trademark infringement suit currently before the District Court, it is clear from an examination of the relevant documentation filed by Opposer in both the Opposition and Civil Action that the parties involved are identical and that the issues involved before the District Court involve the totality of issues currently at issue in the present Opposition Proceeding.

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

26

25

27 28

As the cause of action presently before the District Court is for trademark infringement, the cause of action alleged by the Plaintiff in the Civil Action involves identical and nearly identical rules of law, allegations, and will be adjudicated on the basis of a formal examination of the same or an even more expansive set of relevant facts.

The position of the parties in both disputes are similarly situated; in both the Oppostiion and Civil Action, it is the Opposer seeking remedies as the Plaintiff. The same allegations are at issue in the two proceedings and the same relevant facts will be cited by both parties to support their respective positions. Further, the same Federal Trademark Law will be relied upon by the District Court and by the Board in the respective proceedings as both assess the claims and evidence of both parties and move to make a final determination and render a judgment. Specifically, with both disputes centered on allegations that the other party has infringed a party's trademark rights, the ultimate determination in either matter would ultimately come down to the issue of which party has valid and superior trademark rights over the other parties.

As the primary issue that will determinative of the outcome of both proceedings is the same, specifically, which party can establish priority of first use of their respective trademarks, it is clear that the issues, facts and law that the District Court will find relevant to make its final determination are almost identical to those that the Board would rely upon to make a final ruling the present proceeding. If the District Court were to rule in favor of either party, the Board would be bound to reflect such a ruling when moving to issue a final judgment in the present Opposition proceeding.

As the Plaintiff has requested, among other things, relief in the form of injunctive relief, damages, and attorney's fees, it is not possible for the issues now present in the Civil Action to be adjudicated by the Board. Further, it is clear that any continued involvement by the parties in the present Opposition would be

redundant and would also be wasteful of the limited resources currently afforded to the USPTO for opposition and cancellation proceedings.

As such, and considering the binding effect of any determination made by the District Court in the Civil Action, it is the position of the Registrant that it is in the best interests of the parties and for judicial efficiency to allow for the Civil Action to proceed while the present Opposition proceeding is suspended pending the outcome of the Civil Action. Once there is a final ruling or a final resolution in some other form is reached, the parties of the Court itself will inform the Board of the District Court's decision, and the Board can then decide what is the appropriate manner with which to proceed at that time. See The Other Tel. Co. v. Conn. Nat'l Tel. Co., Inc., 181 U.S.P.Q. 125, 126-7 (T.T.A.B. 1974).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that this action be suspended pending the outcome of the District Court litigation and until the proceeding is considered to have been finally determined as when a decision on the merits of the case (i.e., a dispositive ruling that ends litigation on the merits) has been rendered, and no appeal has been filed therefrom, or all appeals filed have been decided. See TBMP § 510.02(b).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 22, 2016

EASTMAN & MCCARTNEY LLP

Opp. No.: 91215993

By_/s/ Gary L. Eastman Gary L. Eastman, Esq. Attorneys for Applicant KARMA CHAMPAGNE, INC.

EXHIBIT A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27

28

Applicant's Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Outcome of Civil Action Opp. No.: 91215993

Case 6:16-cv-06183 Document 1-1 Filed 03/19/16 Page 1 of 1 CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS 44 (Rev. 09/11)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil decket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KARMA CULTURE, LLC (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Monroe (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				DEFENDANTS KARMA CHAMPAG	GNE, INC	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Diego (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				ON OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Woods Oviatt Gilman LLI Rochester, New York 146		ding, 2 State St.,		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES			
D 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Pri		PTF	DEF
U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		□ 5	5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			in selitori ty	ND DE CHILDE/DENIAL CAVARA	I DAN	UZDIIDTCV	- ATURD	OTE A TELITE	PC
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane 315 Airplane 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 700 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 364 Malpractice 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition Conditions of Confinement	Y	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 6 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 10 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 11 Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 10 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 1 MMIGRATION 12 Naturalization Application 13 Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 15 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U □ PROPEI □ 820 Copy □ 830 Pater ⋈ 840 Trade □ 861 H1A □ 862 Blacl □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSIE □ 870 Taxe or D □ 871 IRS— 26 U	RTY RIGHTS Trights temark SECURITY (1395ff) & Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	375 False Cl. 400 State Re. 410 Antitrust 430 Banks ar 450 Commer 460 Deportat 470 Racketec Corrupt 480 Consum 490 Cable/Sa 850 Securitie Exchang 890 Other St 891 Agricultu 893 Environ 895 Freedom 895 Freedom 896 Arbitrati 899 Adminis	apportionm d Banking cee ion or Influence Organizatio er Credit it TV ss/Commod ge atutory Acts mental Mat of Inform on trative Proc ew or App Decision tionality of	ment g eed and ions dities/ ctions atters nation
	te Court	Appellate Court	Reop	stated of U 3 another specification (specification)		☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 15 USC 01114(1) Brief description of ca), 15 USC 01125, e iuse:	et seq: 2	Do not cite jurisdictional sta 28 USC 1331 and related claims o	.				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$	C	CHECK YES only URY DEMAND:		complaint No	t:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
DATE 03/19/2016		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD	73				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					,				
RECEIPT#AM	моинт	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	••••	MAG. JUI	OGE		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

	Western	District of New York
KAHMA CULTU	IKE, LLC)
Plaintiff(s V. KAHMA CHAMPA Defendant	NGNE, INC.)) () () () () () () () () () () () ()
	SUMMON	S IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	KAHMA CHAMPAGN 2033 San Elijo Avenu Cardiff by the Sea, C	ne e
A lawsuit has been file	ed against you.	
are the United States or a United P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must	ed States agency, or an serve on the plaintiff a	LLP ling
If you fail to respond, You also must file your answe		ill be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. urt.
		CLERK OF COURT
Date:		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

		ne of individual and title, if any)					
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·					
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual	at (place)				
			on (date)				
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or	usual place of abode with (name)				
	on (date), a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there, on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)			, who is		
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beh	alf of (name of organization)				
	_		on (date)	; or			
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because			; or		
	☐ Other (specify):						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$				
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this information	ı is true.				
Date:							
Dute.			Server's signature				
			Printed name and title				
			Server's address				

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	Γ
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR	Ж

KARMA CULTURE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

COMPLAINT

VS.

KARMA CHAMPAGNE, INC.,

Civil Action No. 6:16-cv-6183

Defendant.

Plaintiff, KARMA CULTURE, LLC ("Karma Culture"), as and for its Complaint against Defendant, KARMA CHAMPAGNE, INC. ("Defendant"), alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Plaintiff Karma Culture is a New York corporation with its principal place of business in Pittsford, New York. Karma Culture is engaged in the manufacture, sale and distribution of beverages throughout the United States and abroad.
- 2. Upon information and belief, defendant Karma Champagne, Inc. is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Cardiff by the Sea, California. Karma Champagne, Inc. is engaged in the manufacture, sale and distribution of beverages, including, but not limited to, wines and sparkling wines. Such sale and distribution extends to interstate commerce.
- 3. This is an action for infringement of Plaintiff's federally-registered trademark under Section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1), for unfair competition and false designation of origin under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), and for substantial and related claims of infringement and unfair competition under the statutory and common laws of the State of New York.

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction of this action by virtue of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114 and 1125(a) and the Court has jurisdiction over the State common law claims by virtue of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332(a) 1338(a) and (b), and pursuant to the principles of supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367, as well as CPLR 302(a)(3).
 - 5. Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 6. Karma Culture is a leading manufacturer of high-quality beverages, including a line of spring waters infused with various vitamins, minerals and other supplements (the "Karma Beverage Products").
- 7. On Oct. 19, 2006, Karma Culture filed with the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO") an intent-to-use trademark application for the trademark "KARMA" which subsequently registered as United States Trademark Registration Number 4,063,528, ("the '528 Registration"). A copy of the '528 Registration is attached hereto as **Exhibit "A**."
- 8. Since at least as early as the first use date of September 2, 2011 set forth in the '528 Registration, Karma Culture has continuously used the KARMA mark on and in association with the marketing and sale of the Karma Beverage Products in interstate and foreign commerce.
- 9. Since the date of issuance of the '528 mark in 2011, Karma Culture has been and still is the owner of the KARMA mark and the '528 Registration which has been neither assigned nor transferred.
- 10. Karma Culture has, since the time it registered the KARMA nark, given notice to the public that "KARMA" is a registered trademark by affixing the registration notice next to the KARMA mark as provided by 15 U.S.C. § 1111.
- 11. Since at least 2011, Karma Culture has used the KARMA mark in commerce in connection with its business of manufacturing and selling beverages. Over the years, Karma

Culture has earned a reputation for quality goods and services, personal attention to its customers and integrity in its business dealings and, as such, has earned the respect of both its customers and competitors.

- 12. In the years that its business has been in operation, Karma Culture has advertised and otherwise promoted its products throughout the United States and, as a result, has developed significant name recognition and goodwill and has attained a solid reputation within the marketplace.
- 13. Karma Culture's advertising and other promotional efforts have been undertaken at great expense for the purpose of developing and perpetuating name recognition and goodwill among existing and prospective customers, vendors and other constituencies.
- 14. These advertising and promotional efforts have been effective and Karma Culture's KARMA trademark is associated with Karma Culture within the minds of consumers.

DEFENDANT'S UNLAWFUL ACTIVITIES

- 15. Upon information and belief, Defendant is engaged in, among other things, the offering for sale and selling of beverages, including wines and sparkling wines.
- 16. Without Karma Culture's authorization, and upon information and belief, beginning after Karma Culture acquired protectable exclusive rights in the Karma Culture's KARMA mark, Defendant adopted and began using a mark substantially identical to Karma Culture's KARMA mark in US commerce.
- 17. Without the permission of Karma Culture, Defendant has produced, advertised and sold beverages under the name "Karma." The packaging for this product prominently displays the name "Karma" in conspicuously large print.

- 18. A reasonably prudent consumer could easily confuse or misconstrue such advertising and marking on the packaging of the product to assume the existence of a connection between Defendant's product and Karma Culture's KARMA mark.
- 19. By utilizing the "Karma" name for its beverages, Defendant has attempted to capitalize on the goodwill and reputation of Karma Culture's KARMA brand and '528 mark, which the average public consumer associates with high quality beverages.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Infringement in Violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act)

- 20. Karma Culture realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 19 above.
- 21. Defendant, without consent or license from Karma Culture, has infringed and continues to infringe upon the '528 mark by using the name "Karma" in connection with the sale and distribution of beverages.
- 22. Defendant's use of the '528 mark is likely to cause confusion, mistake and deception and will continue to cause confusion, mistake and deception in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114, until Defendant's actions cease.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant's sale and distribution of the infringing product has and is occurring through both interstate and foreign commerce.
- 24. Karma Culture's use and registration of the '528 mark preceded Defendant's infringing and imitating use of the name "Karma."
- 25. Upon information and belief, Defendant intended and continues to intend to cause confusion and mistake to deceive the buyers of Defendant's products into believing that they were and are buying products produced by, marketed by, sponsored by, approved by or licensed by Karma Culture.

- 32. Defendant's use of the "Karma" name for its products has and continues to deceive, mislead and confuse customers.
- 33. Such actions have constituted, and will continue to constitute unfair competition under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 34. As a proximate result of Defendant's acts, Karma Culture has suffered great detriment to its business, goodwill, reputation and profits, all to its damage in an amount as yet not fully ascertained.
- 35. Defendant's infringement upon the '528 mark has deprived Karma Culture of its rightful ability to police the quality of goods uniquely associated with its mark and to ensure that its valuable goodwill and reputation are protected.
- 36. Karma Culture is entitled to all remedies available under the Lanham Act, including, but not limited to, injunctive relief, compensatory damages, treble damages, and disgorgement of profits.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Infringement and Injury to Business Reputation in Violation of New York General Business Law Sections 360-k and 360-l)

- 37. Karma Culture realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 36 above.
- 38. Defendant's labeling of its products with the name "Karma" is likely to cause confusion or mistake among consumers regarding the source of Defendant's infringing product.
- 39. Due to the similar nature of the products sold by Karma Culture and the infringing products sold by Defendant, an average consumer seeking to purchase beverages reasonably could believe that a connection exists between the infringing products and Karma Culture and/or the '528 mark.

- 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's continued infringement upon the '528 mark, Karma Culture will suffer immediate and irreparable harm to the reputation of its business and the value of the '528 mark itself.
- 41. Karma Culture is entitled to injunctive, monetary and all other relief pursuant to New York General Business Law Sections 360-k, 360-l, and 360-m.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff Karma Culture demands with respect to each of its claims:

- A. Granting a permanent injunction, restraining and enjoining the Defendant, its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees and all others acting on its behalf or in its stead, from further acts of trade name infringement and unfair competition and, more particularly, from, in any manner, directly or indirectly:
 - (i) using the mark KARMA and any other marks which are confusingly similar to or marks that are dilutive to or otherwise violate Karma Culture's KARMA trademark;
 - (ii) using or otherwise exploiting the mark KARMA and any other marks which are confusingly similar to or otherwise violate Karma Culture's KARMA trademark in connection with beverages;
 - (iii) assisting, aiding or abetting any other person or entity from engaging or performing any of the activities referred to in subparagraphs 1(i)–(ii) above;
 - (iv) declaring that the Defendant has unfairly competed with the Plaintiff by the acts complained of herein and further declaring the respective rights and responsibilities of the parties;
- B. Granting an order requiring the Defendant to deliver up for destruction all products, and all promotional and/or advertising materials of any kind bearing the mark KARMA and any other marks which are confusingly similar to or otherwise violate Karma Culture's KARMA trademark;
- C. Awarding to Karma Culture any profits generated by the Defendant as a result of the acts complained of and further awarding Karma Culture its damages as a result of the Defendant's wrongful trademark infringement and unfair competition in an amount to be determined by an accounting, if necessary;
- D. Awarding Karma Culture its attorneys' fees and costs; and

Case 6:16-cv-06183 Document 1 Filed 03/19/16 Page 7 of 10

E. Granting Karma Culture such other and further relief as to this Court may seem just and proper.

DATED: March 19, 2016 Rochester, New York WOODS OVIATT GILMAN LLP

By:

Donald W. O'Brien, Jr., Esq. Katherine H. McGuire, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff 700 Crossroads Building 2 State Street Rochester, New York 14614 585.987.2800 dobrien@woodsoviatt.com

kmcguire@woodsoviatt.com

EXHIBIT A

Anited States of America United States Patent and Trademark Office

KARMA

Reg. No. 4,063,528

KARMA CULTURE, LLC (NEW YORK LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY)

P.O. BOX 698

Registered Nov. 29, 2011 MENDON, NY 14506

Int. Cl.: 5

TRADEMARK

FOR: DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS IN THE NATURE OF STIMULANTS IN LIQUID FORM MADE FROM BOTANICALS, ALGAE, SPICES, AND HERBS FOR USE IN RESTORING MENTAL ALERTNESS, ALL FOR NON-MEDICINAL PURPOSES, IN CLASS 5 (U.S. CLS. 6,

18, 44, 46, 51 AND 52).

PRINCIPAL REGISTER

FIRST USE 9-2-2011; IN COMMERCE 9-2-2011.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PAR-

TICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

SN 77-024,533, FILED 10-19-2006.

STEVEN PEREZ, EXAMINING ATTORNEY



REQUIREMENTS TO MAINTAIN YOUR FEDERAL TRADEMARK REGISTRATION

WARNING: YOUR REGISTRATION WILL BE CANCELLED IF YOU DO NOT FILE THE DOCUMENTS BELOW DURING THE SPECIFIED TIME PERIODS.

Requirements in the First Ten Years* What and When to File:

First Filing Deadline: You must file a Declaration of Use (or Excusable Nonuse) between the 5th and 6th years after the registration date. See 15 U.S.C. §§1058, 1141k. If the declaration is accepted, the registration will continue in force for the remainder of the ten-year period, calculated from the registration date, unless cancelled by an order of the Commissioner for Trademarks or a federal court.

Second Filing Deadline: You must file a Declaration of Use (or Excusable Nonuse) and an Application for Renewal between the 9th and 10th years after the registration date.*

See 15 U.S.C. §1059.

Requirements in Successive Ten-Year Periods* What and When to File:

You must file a Declaration of Use (or Excusable Nonuse) and an Application for Renewal between every 9th and 10th-year period, calculated from the registration date.*

Grace Period Filings*

The above documents will be accepted as timely if filed within six months after the deadlines listed above with the payment of an additional fee.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will NOT send you any future notice or reminder of these filing requirements.

*ATTENTION MADRID PROTOCOL REGISTRANTS: The holder of an international registration with an extension of protection to the United States under the Madrid Protocol must timely file the Declarations of Use (or Excusable Nonuse) referenced above directly with the USPTO. The time periods for filing are based on the U.S. registration date (not the international registration date). The deadlines and grace periods for the Declarations of Use (or Excusable Nonuse) are identical to those for nationally issued registrations. See 15 U.S.C. §§1058, 1141k. However, owners of international registrations do not file renewal applications at the USPTO. Instead, the holder must file a renewal of the underlying international registration at the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, under Article 7 of the Madrid Protocol, before the expiration of each ten-year term of protection, calculated from the date of the international registration. See 15 U.S.C. §1141j. For more information and renewal forms for the international registration, see http://www.wipo.int/madrid/en/.

NOTE: Fees and requirements for maintaining registrations are subject to change. Please check the USPTO website for further information. With the exception of renewal applications for registered extensions of protection, you can file the registration maintenance documents referenced above online at http://www.uspto.gov.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that a true and complete copy of the foregoing Answer to Opposition has been served on the Opposer Karma Culture, LLC by mailing a copy of the same on March 22, 2016 via First Class Mail, postage prepaid to: Katherine H. McGuire, Esq. Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP 2 State Street700 Crossroads Building Rochester, NY 14614 Executed in San Diego, California on March 22, 2016. By_/s/ Gary L. Eastman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE